

REMARKS

Election of Species and Withdrawn Claims

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 21-23 are withdrawn as being directed to non-elected species. Applicants assume that upon determination that the elected species, examination will be extended to the non-elected species of claims 21-23.

Amendments

Claim 1 is amended to recite that the display has only one +C plate. See, e.g., Figure 1 and the embodiments listed in Tables 1 and 2, wherein the displays contain only one +C plate. Claim 1 is also amended to recite that the at least one +A plate and the only one +C plate are situated on the same side of the liquid crystal cell. See, e.g., original claim 9 and page 11, lines 4-5. Claim 1 is also amended to recite that the only one +C plate is closer than the at least one +A plate to a polarizer positioned on the same side of the liquid crystal cell as the +A plate and the +C plate. See, e.g., configurations 1, 4, 15, and 16 of Table 1 and page 13, lines 4-5. Finally, claim 1 is amended to recite that the optical axis of the at least one +A plate is parallel to the stretch axis of the polarizer that is situated on the same side of the liquid crystal cell as the +A plate and the +C plate.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12-18, and 25-26 are amended to be consistent with the language of amended claim 1. Claims 3, 7-9, 11, 19, and 24 are cancelled. Due to the cancellation of claim 7, claims 10 and 20-23 are amended to depend from claim 1.

New claim 27 is similar to claim 26, but is dependent on claim 25. Claims 28-30 are directed to embodiments previously recited in cancelled claim 8. Claims 31-32 are each similar to cancelled claim 24, but are dependent on claims 29-30, respectively. Claim 33 is similar to claim 6, but is dependent on claim 5. Claim 34 is directed to subject matter cancelled from claim 10. Finally, new claim 35 is directed to a further aspect of the invention and is supported by the disclosure at, for example, page 11, lines 23-35.

Rejection under 35 USC 102(b)

Claim 11 is rejected as allegedly being anticipated in view of Allen et al. (US 2003/019636).

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 11. However, it is respectfully submitted that Allen et al. fails to anticipate prior claim 11 because Allen et al. fail to disclose any specific embodiment comprising a +A plate.

Allen et al. merely refer generally to the possibility of using a-plates. See paragraphs [0023], [0027], [0030], and [0039]. None of the specific embodiments disclosed by Allen et al. contain a +A plate. Mere disclosure of a generic concept does not anticipate each and every embodiment encompassed therein. Thus, the Allen et al. disclosure fails to anticipate applicants' prior claim 11.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1-10, 12-20, and 24-26 are rejected as allegedly being obvious in view of Allen et al. (US 2003/019636) in combination with Park (US 2003/0043329). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Allen et al. disclose an optical compensator for use in liquid crystal displays. In paragraph [0008], Allen et al. disclose an embodiment of a liquid crystal display having the following components in the following order: a) a first o-plate; b) a first c-plate; c) a liquid crystal cell; d) a second c-plate; and e) a second o-plate. Such an embodiment is illustrated in Figure 4. As can be seen, this embodiment contains more than one c-plate and no a-plates.

In paragraph [0009], Allen et al. disclose another embodiment of a liquid crystal display having the following components in the following order: a) a first o-plate; b) a first retarder; c) a liquid crystal cell; d) a second retarder; and e) a second o-plate. At least one of these first and second retarders is a biaxial retarder, while the other can be another biaxial retarder or a c-plate. Such an embodiment is illustrated in Figure 6. This embodiment does not contain only one c-plate and at least one a-plate.

In Figure 3, Allen et al. illustrate an embodiment of a liquid crystal display having the following components in the following order: a) first polarizer 308; b) first o-plate 304; c) a liquid crystal cell 302; d) a second o-plate 306; and e) a second polarizer 310. This

embodiment does not contain any c-plates or any a-plates.

In Figure 5, Allen et al. illustrate an embodiment of a liquid crystal display having the following components in the following order: a) first polarizer 508; b) first c-plate 520; c) first o-plate 512; d) second c-plate 514; e) a liquid crystal cell 502; f) third c-plate 518; g) a second o-plate 516; h) fourth c-plate 522; and e) a second polarizer 510. This embodiment does not contain only one c-plate. Nor does it contain any a-plates.

In Figures 7 and 8, Allen et al. illustrate embodiments of liquid crystal displays that have an arrangement of components the same as shown in Figure 4: a) first polarizer; b) first o-plate; c) first c-plate; d) a liquid crystal cell; e) a second c-plate; f) second o-plate; and g) a second polarizer. These embodiments do not contain only one c-plate. Nor do they contain any a-plates.

The Examples of Allen et al. involve similar arrangements of the components in the liquid crystal display. In Examples 1-12, 25, 26, 29, 30, 33-40, and 47-48, the arrangement, in order, is: a first o-plate; a first c-plate; a liquid crystal cell; a second c-plate; and a second o-plate. See, e.g., Fig. 4. In Examples 13-24, the arrangement, in order, is: a first c-plate; a first o-plate; a liquid crystal cell; a second o-plate; and a second c-plate. In Examples 27, 28, 31, 32, 43, 44, and 51-54, the arrangement, in order, is: a first c-plate; a first o-plate; a second c-plate; a liquid crystal cell; a third c-plate; a second o-plate; and a fourth c-plate. See, e.g., Fig. 5.

In Examples 41, 42, 49, and 50, the arrangement, in order, is: a first o-plate; a first retarder; a liquid crystal cell; a second retarder; and a second o-plate. See Fig. 6. In Examples 45, 46, and 55-58, the arrangement, in order, is: a first c-plate; a first o-plate; a first retarder; a liquid crystal cell; a second retarder; a second o-plate; and a second c-plate.

It is noted that in paragraph [0039], Allen et al. refers to optional a-plates. However, Allen et al. do not describe or suggest any embodiment having at least one +A plate and only one +C plate.

Furthermore, Allen et al. do not describe or suggest any embodiment having at least one +A plate and only one +C plate which are situated on the same side of a liquid crystal cell. Similarly, the Allen et al. disclosure is devoid of any description or suggestion of an embodiment having at least one +A plate and only one +C plate which are both situated on the same side of a liquid crystal cell, and wherein the one +C plate is closer than the at least

+A plate to a polarizer positioned on the same side of the liquid crystal cell. Additionally, the Allen et al. disclosure is silent with respect the arrangement of the optical axis of any +A plate relative to any other component, and particularly is silent with respect to the optical axis of an +A plate being parallel to the stretch axis of a polarizer that is situated on the same side of the liquid crystal cell as the +A plate and a +C plate.

With regards to Park (US '32(9), the rejection relies on Park's disclosure of an IPS liquid crystal display. See, e.g., paragraphs [0003] and [0008], and the Figures. In the rejection, it is asserted that it would be obvious to use a configuration of Allen et al. with an IPS liquid crystal display.

However, the disclosure of Park does not overcome the deficiencies in the disclosure of Allen et al. discussed above. The Park disclosure does not mention compensators, c-plates, and/or a-plates. Thus, Park provides no suggestion to modify the arrangements of Allen et al. in such a manner as to arrive at an embodiment in accordance with applicants' claimed invention.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of Allen et al., take alone or in combination with the disclosure of Park, fails to render obvious applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brion P. Heaney/

Brion P. Heaney, Reg. No. 32,542
Attorney for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza I
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400
Arlington, VA 22201
Direct Dial: 703-812-5308
Facsimile: 703-243-6410
Attorney Docket No.:MERCK-3078
Date: August 12, 2009

MERCK-3078